

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars.

1. U.S. patent 6,220,732 (Paffrath) not listed on PTO-892

The applicant respectfully requests that the Paffrath patent be included on a PTO-892 in the next Office communication, since the Paffrath patent is used in a rejection in the Office Action dated September 21, 2005, but is not listed on the PTO-892 included therewith.

2. In the claims

As shown in the foregoing amendment to the claims, the claims have been amended to more clearly point out the subject matter for which protection is sought and to correct minor informalities and provide more clarity. No new matter is added.

Claim 1 is amended to clarify that the module has "lower and rear walls", support for which is clearly found in at least Figs. 3 and 4 of the pending application.

Claim 1 is also amended to recite "that at least two opposite sidewalls or upper and lower walls extend in non-parallel directions," support for which is clearly found in at least Figs. 2 and 4 of the pending application.

Claim 13 is amended to remove reference to the rear wall in order to prevent a double inclusion.

Claims 1-17 are amended to remove reference numerals, which has no limiting effect, per U.S. practice.

These amendments to the claims are not substantive in nature, and no waiver of equivalents is anticipated.

Entry of the amendment to the claims is respectfully requested in the next Office communication.

3. Rejection of claims 1-3, 7, 8, 11-14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 5,410,328 (Yoksza et al.)

This rejection is respectfully traversed, in view of the amendment to claim 1, on the basis that the Yoksza et al. patent does not disclose every limitation of pending claims 1-3, 7, 8, 11-14 and 17.

The Yoksza et al. patent does not disclose “at least some of the side walls and of the upper and lower walls are tapered inwardly, enclosing an angle with the front wall, such that at least two opposite sidewalls or upper and lower walls extend in non-parallel directions”, as is now required by pending claim 1.

While the Yoksza et al. patent discloses a rear wall that is inclined with upper and lower walls, it does not disclose the wall configuration of the pending claims. The Yoksza et al. patent discloses upper (12), right side (14), lower (16) and left side (18) walls that are at right angles to one another. (Col. 2, lines 62-68). The Yoksza et al. patent also discloses a rear wall (20) that is inclined with respect to the upper (12) and lower (16) walls. (Col. 3, lines 5-12). The Yoksza et al. patent discloses a display board (48) that acts as a front wall and is positioned with the upper (12), right side (14), lower (16) and left side (18) walls so as to be *perpendicular* therewith. (Col. 4, lines 59-62). Since the Yoksza et al. patent requires the side, front and lower walls to be perpendicular to the front wall, the Yoksza et al. patent cannot disclose that any of the side, front or lower walls tapered inwardly, at non-parallel directions, from the front wall.

The Yoksza et al. patent cannot be modified to include some of the side, front or lower walls tapered inwardly, at non-parallel directions, from the front wall. Because the Yoksza et al. patent requires the side, front and lower walls to be perpendicular to the front wall, the Yoksza et al. patent specifically teaches away from the pending claims which require at least some of the side, front or lower walls tapered inwardly, at non-parallel directions, from the front wall. Additionally, the Yoksza et al. patent requires the rear wall (20) to be inclined with respect to the upper

(12) and lower (16) walls in order to provide better line of sight, since these types of displays are typically mounted such that people are required to look up at the display. (Col. 3, lines 5-12). There is no suggestion to modify the Yoksza et al. patent with some of the side, front or lower walls tapered inwardly, at non-parallel directions, from the front wall, because such a modification would destroy the required function of the Yoksza et al. patent that the device provide a better line of sight to people who are required to look up at the display.

In light of the above arguments, it also clear that the Yoksza et al. patent does not disclose a wall configuration including side walls, an upper wall and a lower wall that are all tapered inwardly, as is required by pending claim 2.

With regards to pending claim 11, the Yoksza et al. patent does not disclose that the sunshade (24) has a texture that is capable of performing the function of improving contrast. The Yoksza et al. patent does not disclose the sunshade having any texture at all, but it would appear from the figures and disclosure that the sunshade is smooth. There is no disclosure in the Yoksza et al. patent that this smooth texture of the sunshade can improve the contrast.

In view of these comments, it is submitted that the Yoksza et al. patent does not disclose side, front or lower walls that are tapered inwardly, at non-parallel directions, from a front wall; moreover the Yoksza et al. patent cannot be modified with this structure without destroying the function of the device in the Yoksza et al. patent

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

4. Rejection of claims 4-6, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,410,328 (Yoksza et al.) in view of G.B. patent 840,329 (F. T. Products Limited)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested in light of the amendments to claim 1 and the remarks in section 3 above. The F. T. Products Limited patent does not make up for the shortcomings of the Yoksza et al. patent. The F. T. Products Limited patent does not disclose or suggest "at least some of the side walls and of the upper and lower walls are tapered inwardly, enclosing an angle with the front wall, such that at least two opposite sidewalls or upper and lower walls extend in non-parallel directions", as is now required by pending claim 1.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

5. Rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,410,328 (Yoksza et al.) in view of U.S. patent 5,733,154 (Libregts)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested in light of the amendments to claim 1 and the remarks in section 3 above. The Libregts patent does not make up for the shortcomings of the Yoksza et al. patent. The Libregts patent does not disclose or suggest "at least some of the side walls and of the upper and lower walls are tapered inwardly, enclosing an angle with the front wall, such that at least two opposite sidewalls or upper and lower walls extend in non-parallel directions", as is now required by pending claim 1.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

6. Rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,410,328 (Yoksza et al.) in view of U.S. patent 6,220,732 (Paffrath)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested in light of the amendments to claim 1 and the remarks in section 3 above. The Paffrath patent does

Application No.: 10/697,093
Examiner: G. D. Olander
Art Unit: 2879

not make up for the shortcomings of the Yoksza et al. patent. The Paffrath patent does not disclose or suggest "at least some of the side walls and of the upper and lower walls are tapered inwardly, enclosing an angle with the front wall, such that at least two opposite sidewalls or upper and lower walls extend in non-parallel directions", as is now required by pending claim 1.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Application No.: 10/697,093
Examiner: G. D. Olander
Art Unit: 2879

7. Conclusion

As a result of the amendment to the claims, and further in view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that every pending claim in the present application be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the applicants' attorney, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

Date: January 23, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Justin J. Cassell", written over a horizontal line.

JUSTIN J. CASSELL
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,205